REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 981 JC 670 829

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL UNIVERSITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE CONFERENCE (5TH, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 2, 1963).
BY- GILES, FREDERIC T.
WASHINGTON UNIV., SEATTLE

PUB DATE FEB 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.40 58P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *ARTICULATION (PROGRAM), *UNIVERSITIES, *TRANSFER STUDENTS, *TRANSFER POLICY, TRANSFER PROGRAMS, HIGHER EDUCATION,

THESE PROCEEDINGS REFLECT THE UNIVERSITY'S GROWING CONCERN FOR THE TRANSFER STUDENT AND AN AWARENESS OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS THAT CAN BE COOPERATIVELY SOLVED. THE TRANSFER STUDENT'S STATUS WILL CONTINUE TO RISE AS STATE AND PROFESSIONAL GROUPS WORK TO INCREASE THE NUMBER AND QUALITY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. WHILE EFFECTS OF CURRICULUM CHANGES ON THE PROSPECTIVE TRANSFER SHOULD BE MINIMIZED, ARTICULATION PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCH CHANGES ARE COMPLEX, SINCE (1) STUDENTS COME FROM MANY KINDS OF INSTITUTIONS, (2) CHANGE IS A COMPLEX PROCESS EVEN WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY, WITHOUT INVOLVING OTHER AGENCIES, (3) THE PROCESS IS SO LENGTHY THAT NO TIME SEEMS REALLY APPROPRIATE FOR OUTSIDE DISCUSSION, (4) THE NEEDS OF THE TRANSFERS ARE CONSIDERED AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE DURING THE PROCESS, AND (5) COLLEGES, STUDENTS, AND THE COMMUNITY SHOULD BECOME AWARE THAT NOT ALL LOWER DIVISION PROGRAMS ARE INTERCHANGEABLE. THE CONFERENCE ALSO INCLUDED (1) A STUDY OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFER STUDENTS, (2) STATISTICAL EXAMPLES AS PATTERNS FOR MORE COMPREHENSIVE, ADMINISTRATIVELY USEFUL STATISTICAL WORK, AND (3) DETAILED DISCUSSION OF (A) A JUNIOR COLLEGE COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE SERVICE, (B) CURRENT UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS, (C) ANTICIPATED EFFECTS ON PREREQUISITES OF THE INTRODUCTION OF A BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY, AND (D) A COMPARISON OF JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COURSE CONTENT IN ENGINEERING AND RELATED FIELDS. ((HH)

ED014981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 8 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Fifth Annual

University-Junior College Conference

January 31-February 2, 1963

University of Washington

JC 670 829

PROCEEDINGS

Fifth Annual
University-Junior College Conference

January 31-February 2, 1963

University of Washington

Sponsored by
The University - Junior College Committee
and
The Office of College Relations

FOREWORD

The *Proceedings* represents a record of the meetings and discussions which took place at the Fifth Annual University-Junior College Conference held January 31-February 2, 1963, on the University of Washington campus.

The Conference is held annually to enable the faculties and administrations of the Washington State community colleges and of the University of Washington to meet to discuss common problems and interests.

The three major aims of the Conference are: 1) to facilitate interviews between junior college personnel and their former students, 2) to consider and discuss important mutual problems, and 3) to provide an opportunity for specific departmental discussion groups.

Each session or discussion group is represented in the *Proceedings* by either the addresses given, the minutes of the discussions, or, in some cases, a combination of both.

Frederic T. Giles
Professor of Higher Education
Coordinator of College Relations
University of Washington

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, JANUARY 31

Student Interview Sessions

Joint Meeting of Deans of Women

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1

Registration

General Session

Presiding: Robert Briggs, Chairman, University's Junior College Committee

Welcome: Charles E. Odegaard, President, University of Washington

Keynote Address: "The University and the Transfer Student"
Glenn Leggett, Vice-Provost, University of Washington

Presentations and Discussions on University-Junior College Relations:

"The Junior College and the Transfer Student"
James M. Starr, President, Wenatchee Valley College

"Curricular Change and the Transfer Student"
William L. Phillips, Assistant Dean, University's College of Arts and Sciences

Luncheon

Discussion Sessions

Administration

Topic: "What Do We Know and What Do We Need to Know About Transfers?"

Chairman: Frederic T. Giles, Coordinator, Office of College Relations, University of Washington

PROGRAM (Cont'd)

Presentations: Dorothy Knoell, Associate Research Psychologist, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

Robert E. Guild, Coordinator, Institutional Educational Research, University of Washington

Counseling and Guidance

Chairman: Jeanette Poore, Dean of Students, Everett Junior College

Admissions and Registrars

Chairman: Kenneth Thiessen, Registrar, Skagit Valley College

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2

Departmental Conferences

Business Administration

Engineering, Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword iii

Program v

Student Interview and Joint Deans of Women Sessions 1

GENERAL SESSION

The University and the Transfer Student 3
Glenn Leggett

The Junior College and the Transfer Student 13
James M. Starr

Curricular Change and the Transfer Student 19
William L. Phillips

DISCUSSION SESSIONS

Administration

A Study of the Factors Affecting the Performance of Students Transferring from Two- to Four-Year Colleges: Some Preliminary Findings Based on a Sample of Participating Four-Year Colleges 25
Dorothy M. Knoell

Some Statistics on Junior College Transfers to the University of Washington 33
Robert E. Guild

Counseling and Guidance 43

Admissions and Registrars 47

DEPARTMENTAL CONFERENCES

Business Administration 49

Engineering, Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics 55

STUDENT INTERVIEW SESSIONS

The Student Interview Sessions are arranged to offer an opportunity for junior college counselors and guidance personnel to talk with their former students now attending the University of Washington. It has been expressed that these informal talks with former students have provided junior college personnel with accurate, first-hand information on problems that may have confronted students in transferring to the University. It is hoped that an understanding of their experiences will help to improve University and junior college advisory services.

JOINT MEETING OF DEANS OF WOMEN

An informal meeting for junior college Deans of Women was conducted by Dean Dorothy Strawn, University Dean of Women, in McCarty Hall. The discussion centered on subjects concerning women transfer students.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE TRANSFER STUDENT - A NARRATIVE

Glenn Leggett
Vice-Provost, University of Washington

My account begins, on a morning, at my home, eight miles from the campus. The car I drive to work is old and balky, and this morning it is particularly fussy, so that by the time I get off the back streets and on the main highway behind a Volkswagen, I know I am not starting the day properly. At the top of the hill, somewhat alarmed at the increasing strength of my desire to run into and over the Volkswagen, I pull into a service station to fill up with gas and calm down. I am still out of luck. Blocking a whole row of pumps with his new white Cadillac is one of my expense-account neighbors. He is out of the car admiring it and his own relationship to it, and when he sees me sitting in my car waiting for my turn, he walks over. His eyes go from his new Cadillac to my older non-Cadillac, and then to the morning paper in his hand. He opens it up, obviously to start a conversation about something in it. The headlines speak of the Governor's budget message, and I know that Mr. Cadillac is going to get around to taxes, the high cost of education, and his own good sense and character in being against both. He points to the word "austerity" in the budget story. You educators don't use your help efficiently, he says, and you spend too much on trifles and too much on fancy buildings. I look at the 50¢ cigar in his hand and the whirling meter in the ethyl pump which has been pouring 20 gallons of gasoline into the Cadillac, but his hypocrisy is so long-standing and ingrained that he is not even aware of it.

He goes on. No need to give the University any tax money for freshmen and sophomores, he says: let the junior colleges do it. They can do it cheaper because they don't need all those expensive professors around, and they can do it easier because they can concentrate on it and nothing else. Education is getting too complicated, he concludes; let's get back to fundamentals. I think of the questions that any knowledgeable school director or superintendent would like to ask him about the easiness involved in building and financing, and above all of staffing, a two-year college. And I think of the complexities of university intra-relationships, of the effects of freshmen and sophomores on upper class programs, of the difficulty of defining that point between higher education and "higher, higher" education, of the impact of students on professors and their research, of the whole web of student-faculty and curricular relationships, of the unique cluster of both philosophical and physical environments that makes a university. But all of this is beyond articulation in the time I have to answer, and I tell Mr. Cadillac only that education is complicated because the world that needs it is complicated, that we probably require several kinds of educational institutions to meet the varieties of demands of the world in 1963, and that he ought to be suspicious of simple answers to complex questions. But he is of the stuff that all energetic fools are made of and he obviously considers my answers professorial and unrealistic. As he walks back to his car, opens the door and pushes his stomach by the steering wheel, I make a note to myself to try to waylay him at a neighborhood party sometime when I can start an educational argument in a context he can't walk away from, but I know really that he is beyond persuasion. He is against everything except more money for himself: that will always be his version of fiscal responsibility.

As the station owner is pumping gas into my car, his son, a young man in his early twenties, comes up carrying a battered briefcase and asks if he can ride to the campus with me. He waits at the station every day and hitches a ride with me or one of my university neighbors. Because he is polite and obviously concerned with getting an education, he is pleasant company and I am glad to have him with me again. He graduated from high school five or six years ago, with a lousy record, as he puts it, because he spent all his real energy souping up cars, discovering girls, and thinking about how much money he could have to do both when he finished high school and could work at a regular job. The regular jobs, however, were never satisfactory, chiefly because his employers never took his ambitions to get ahead with only a high school education seriously, and because they all kept reminding him of the draft. Half in desperation, he finally decided to go into the army and get his service over. He learned almost immediately that the men who managed that society had college educations, and he began to reflect that the circumstance was probably true in the civilian world too. He then made certain decisions about himself, and when his hitch was over, began to commute regularly to a nearby junior college. In the beginning, it was agony. He told me he was assigned to the remedial section in every course he took. But the teachers were experienced and sympathetic with his sort, and in six months with their help he had brought himself to the point where, verbally and mathematically, he was literate and educable. Within another six months, he was an average student, and by the time he got his associate-in-arts degree and was ready to transfer to a four-year college, he was a very good student indeed, soaking up knowledge and becoming what we want all our students to become, disciplined and responsible human beings.

He is also a living expert on junior college-university relationships, without knowing it, and I had many times before enjoyed questioning him about details of his double experience. Today I tell him about Mr. Cadillac's solution to the problems of higher education in the state, and the young man smiles. Baloney, he says. If we all graduated from high school knowing all that we should have learned; and if we all were the same age, with the same background; and if we knew exactly what we wanted to be, then one kind of college would be fine. But these are big and really impossible ifs. I, for one, wouldn't have made it at the University, he says. It's not that the subjects are harder or the teachers are tougher. It's just that everyone, including other students, assumes that everyone is prepared, that everyone is ready, willing, and able, and operates accordingly. At junior college I had the time to get organized and the kind of teachers who knew what I was trying to do and could help me. And he concludes neatly by telling me that because the world is so full of different kinds of people we probably need more kinds of colleges, not fewer. By this time, we are on the campus, and he asks to be dropped off for his first class, a course in psychology. As he gets out of the car, I ask him how he likes the class. Marvelous, he says. Two years ago if I had had this instructor, I'd have thought him a disorganized nut; now I think he's a disorganized genius. See what junior college did for me.

I feel a little better now, and am able to be more patient about dodging the students who walk unconcernedly across the street in heavy traffic. But when I get to the office, my mood changes completely. Waiting to talk to me is Professor Status. I had suggested he drop by so we could talk about his serving on an important campus committee on junior college-university relations, and I know he wouldn't be on hand at 8:05 a.m. if he were going to be agreeable about accepting. He is in his late 30's and already quite stuffily professorial and full of self-admiration. Have one of those abominable 8:30 classes this term and thought I'd drop by just before for a chat about that committee bit you want me to do, he says. I look at the stack of mail on the desk, hear the phones already ringing, but I set my face to be polite, for he can be irritating. He is certainly not overtly incompetent, either as a teacher or scholar, but he is essentially an adequacy masquerading as a first-rater, a poser. In the faculty senate, he talks grandly of research, scholarship, standards, academic freedom, and the importance of nonconformity. At lunch in the Faculty Club he talks warmly of the virtues of foreign cars, California wines, outdoor cooking, Italian movies, and now that they are dead, W. C. Fields, Marilyn Monroe, and Athenian democracy. At cocktail parties, his conversation is directed against college athletics, junior colleges, teachers colleges, colleges of education, student ratings of teachers; and if the martinis have been strong enough, college administrators in general, who he says are basically nonacademic types who should leave the faculty alone and tend to their clerical chores.

At home he is a Victorian administrator à la Mr. Barrett of Wimpole Street, demanding respect for all his indulgences and brooking no democratic outbursts. He is of course firmly set against television: a matter of taste, he says; a matter of his wanting us to babysit his children, his neighbors say. In the classroom, he is a tyrant, being arbitrary about lateness and misinterpretations from his students, and quite relaxed about his own tardiness to class and his use of last year's notes in his lectures. Brought up academically on what college president Harold Stoke called the "easy victories of the classroom," he is persuaded that all the problems of students, college administrators, businessmen, politicians, indeed those of the public generally, are really quite simple, that only his world is really complicated. To keep himself in this persuasion in the presence of continuing reality, he has had to construct an elaborate mythology about the superiority of his own generalizations to objective fact.

I know he is going to turn down our request to serve on the junior college committee, and I am curious to see how he will play it. Ostensibly, of course, his reasons will be quite clear and legitimate: research progressing very nicely, new courses to prepare for, several articles nearly finished, conference lecture to write up for publication, by invitation of the editor, of course, and so forth. Somewhere in the monologue will be a piece about scholars belonging to the profession and not to any particular institution, and how essential it is for them to be mobile. There will then follow a few asides about the heavy administrative load on the producing faculty at the University--"clerking" he will call it, and his voice will equate the process with asking Einstein to change a light bulb. Busy-work committee, he says. The number of transfer students can't be very great, and besides they're pretty poor students to begin with; let's put our energy on the good students, where it belongs. I tell him I hope his books are better documented than his statement, that almost half of our baccalaureate degrees are given to transfer students, that their grade-point averages do not indicate they are poor students, and that maybe he might ask the registrar to help him run a count of his own classes--after grades are in, of course. He is nonplussed, but only for a moment, after which he says, what's education coming to, no fixed standards, students jumping from one place to another. I want to reply that students are like your ideal faculty man, belonging to education and not to any particular institution, but he is looking at his watch and I know the interview is over.

After he has left, the secretary comes in and announces that a young man named Brown is waiting to see me. Young Brown, whom I do not admire, is the son of my neighbor, whom I do. Young Brown got into the University in the days when its admission requirements were written to be particularly attractive to marginally qualified students, and by changing colleges and majors occasionally, and by dropping out of school for a quarter now and then, he has managed to survive as an advanced freshman for several years. But now the new probationary regulations have caught up with him, and he has been academically withdrawn from the University. He has come in to see me, not to argue again about the decision, but to get advice on what to do next. This advice, I discover shortly, is really only a request for information: what is the minimum grade point and the number of credit hours he must get from the junior college before the University will take him back? I tell him the Admissions Board doesn't play that way any more, that it weighs his past record against his performance and his ambitions against his recommendations. But he wants specific answers. Can I get back next quarter if I take enough courses and get good enough grades? I doubt it, I say, but anyway you're missing the point, and I ask him why he doesn't stay at the junior college, get committed to it, and give it a chance to educate him. I tell him he might even like it. He wants to tell me to go soak my head, but he manages a polite smile and leaves, unsatisfied and still uneducable.

At this point, I read my mail, stack it into the today, sometime, and much later piles, make a few phone calls to people who luckily aren't in, and then think about the composition of the important junior college committee. The secretary comes in, tells me I have an hour until my next appointment, and suggests a haircut. As I walk toward the Union Building, I catch up with John Trueblood, a youngish-middle-aged professor and one of the best citizens in the University. He is one who handles all the responsibilities of a University faculty man very competently. His scholarship is so widely recognized that he can wear his reputation easily, and he doesn't have to insist on it and use the word research as a club, as Professor Status has to do. And he doesn't talk about his rights; if he talks at all about such things he talks about his responsibilities. He is particularly concerned about his classes: not because he is a lover of students in the abstract and not because the ham in his psyche needs to be aired daily to keep it fresh, but because he believes in his subject, not only for itself, which makes him a scholar, but also as an instrument for educating others, which makes him a teacher. He is not a beloved Mr. Chips teacher; he works students hard and he keeps his conferences with them on the subject, which is their work and their achievement in his class and not on their personalities. But he is very highly respected, and because he teaches everything from freshman surveys to graduate seminars, he is widely known among students and the faculty.

What is particularly important for me at the moment, however, is a special virtue of his. He is an expert on students as students, their preparation or lack of it, their classroom morality, what we might call their educational character. I tell him about our need for a chairman of the junior college committee. He groans good naturedly, but says it sounds interesting, and then goes on to talk expertly about the kind of thing the committee might concern itself with. I keep what you might call loose records of my students, he says, and I note that many of them come from junior colleges--in fact, that the number seems to be increasing. My guess is that about 500 of our new students every fall come from junior colleges. I tell him, with admiration, the figure for this year is 525, and he goes on to say that their preparation in his area seems good in some instances, and only mediocre in others. I was very much concerned about this difference, he goes on, and three or four years ago I wrote to my colleagues in the junior colleges and we arranged a group meeting to talk over some of the things we were doing or should be doing. He goes on to say that he discovered that several of the instructors had passed through his department, that he was now taking a special interest in graduate students who might be going on or going back to teach in junior colleges. You know, he says, I think the root of the junior college problem is the staffing problem--just as it is here--and maybe the committee ought to start there and not with curriculum. I argue with him mildly, saying that it's both, but I am so pleased with him after my unhappy experience with Professor Status that it's easy to be agreeable. As we say goodbye in front of the Union, he tells me he'll let me know in a day or so about the committee. I tell myself that with him and the dozens like him that we have, the University is really in good shape after all. Not perfect, but good; and it strikes me suddenly that perfection probably requires no administration and no administrators, and I don't feel so bad about Professor Status after all.

As I sit in the barbershop and watch the customers come and go, I am impressed once again with the enormous variety in the Washington male student body (the female student body is, of course, not a proper subject). Into the shop come the very young, the late young, the middle aged, the business-like, the college boy types playing hard at being casual, the slide-rule engineers; even a beatnik or two comes in to sneer, and I see the barbers eye them hungrily. I think of my own undergraduate days and my own classmates, all wearing the same kind of saddle shoes, the same charcoal black flannels rolled exactly four turns above the cuff, the same white button-down shirts. And I recite some truths to myself about true individualism being nourished in a busy and varigated environment. Because I've just been talking to Professor Trueblood about junior colleges, I think of how much transfer students probably contribute to this cosmopolitan and varied character of the University, and I decide to ask Professor Giles to make a speech on that subject some day, with the suggestion that Mr. Jim Owens, the director of athletics, might be able to provide him with an interesting statistics or two.

When I get back to the office, I find Mr. Youngblood waiting for me. He was a young teaching assistant when I was supervising the Freshman English courses, and we have since maintained a friendly interest in each other. He has now finished his qualifying exams for the doctorate, has had his year as an acting instructor here and must cut the apron strings. Though not an outstanding student, he has been industrious and sensible, and now has several letters from colleges indicating an interest in his qualifications. He wants to talk about them, and he begins, as he should, by telling me of his professional interests, his ambitions, and his built-in limitations. I am not, as you know, he says, equipped to be a burningly eager scholar, though I like to associate with those who are, and it is going to take me probably three or four years to write the dissertation if I have a full-time teaching job.

He tells me he really would like to go to a place where he could settle down and stay, get his roots in, and become something more than a guy who works there. Accordingly, he says, I'm particularly interested in these two letters from junior college department heads. They both offer good salaries and steady futures, and though much of the teaching will be in freshman composition, I'm not bothered if there's a possibility of a course or two one of these days in literature or advanced writing. But I think the man at junior college A is really looking for a high school teacher of English who happens to have an advanced degree or to be close to one. The teaching schedule, four sections plus two remedial quiz sections, is a man killer, and on top of that he wants me to look after the student publications. I probably won't have any time to write, and maybe not even to think about what I'm doing, and while the salary is better than the other and I like his particular town better, I think junior college B is the one I want. If I read B's letter correctly, there seems to be an understanding that his place is a college and not a post-high school, that the students can be treated like nineteen-year-old adults and not nineteen-year-old children, if you know what I mean. I read the letters and have to admit to his interpretations, but I also tell him that junior college B, the one he prefers, is well-established, that its head and the superintendent and the school board have worked well together for many years, and that in a very real sense it is a community college. The other is new, but it has had to get started somehow, and that after all the term "post-high school" assumes not only a college ahead but a high school in the background. The real question, I say, is not how close the high school today but how close the college tomorrow. But Mr. Youngblood has a problem with his career right now and I know he is going to accept B's offer. I think I would have too, but I suddenly feel very sympathetic toward department head A.

After he leaves I try to get some of the paper off my desk and onto someone else's, and by the time I have one basket empty, it's time for lunch, which today I'm eating with a senior research professor in one of the biological departments, Professor Heartsblood. He has had some administrative problems in classifying researchers working under his National Science Foundation grant and he wants to talk about possible solutions. He is a joy for me to be with, for his naivete about what goes on in 95 per cent of the University is beautifully gentle and wide-eyed and his knowledge about what goes on in advanced physiological chemistry is so profound that he is probably only a whisper away from a Nobel Prize. Almost fifteen post-doctoral fellows, honor graduates from the finest universities in the world, hang on every professional word he utters. When we meet, he asks me what I've been doing all morning and when I tell him, he looks at me quizzically and then asks, gently, what is a junior college committee and what does it do. I tell him, whereupon he pounds the table with his fist, says "good" vigorously, and then reminds me and our colleagues for several tables around that every post-doctoral fellow was once a graduate student who was a college senior who was once a college freshman and further that this continuum is no stronger than its weakest part. By George, put me on the committee, he says. I'm tempted to recommend his appointment, but I know that he is close to a major breakthrough in his research and ought to be left alone, so that I talk him out of it, all the time feeling rather good about the way character and brains and a sense of responsibility frequently go together in a university and produce an ideal of teaching and research and service of almost Platonic beauty.

In the early afternoon the University's Board of Advising meets, and I listen to the academic advisers and the heads of various counseling divisions on campus talk about problems and solutions in orienting new students to the University. This is the discussion of professionals who know each other and are used to each other, and the talk is hard-headed and knowledgeable, ranging from concern with new freshmen to concern with new graduate students, with junior college transfers getting a good deal of attention. The advisers know how much is involved in getting a student adjusted to the size and complexity of the University, but they are also aware that no orientation device, no matter how ingenious, will work unless the courses of study appear to have some direction and unless the instructors appear to enjoy having students around. A friendly argument starts about defining that point at which a student is wholesomely confused and needs to work out his own solutions and that point at which he finds one frustration building on another and is no longer educable but scared and half sick. The debate then gets down to specific examples, individual cases, and I see them as muddying up the issue, which they do.

But--and this is the point where the narrative ends and the sermon begins--I also begin to see them as representing a more central issue, for education is really about individual cases; and though we have to have some generalizations to handle the mounting traffic which education is both a cause and effect of, we need as educators to remind ourselves frequently that eventually we start and end with a fact, a real human being, who lives with real people, occupies a real seat in one of our real classrooms, and writes real exams and papers that have to be read and judged by real people. We can find all sorts of categories to put him in--sophomore or junior, married or unmarried, pre-engineer or pre-major, in-state or out-of-state, local or transfer. Certainly the categories we put him in, if we use them sensibly, can give us useful guides about him, but finally he will evade or outgrow our categories and abstractions, like a real book, a real machine, a real painting, a real poem. Indeed, in the last analysis, the success of our work as educators will be measured by how gracefully and permanently he does evade and outgrow the categories we put him in. And in spite of the special constituencies we represent and in spite of the special pleadings we need to make here, all of us know this to be true, and knowing it and believing it will unite us and keep us sane.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE TRANSFER PROGRAM

James M. Starr
President, Wenatchee Valley College

It is with considerable pride that I appear here at the University of Washington, representing the community colleges of the state, to speak at this opening session of the Fifth Annual University-Junior College Conference. I am not sure why I was permitted this privilege - perhaps because other more capable, but more timid, of my colleagues refused, perhaps because I may now be looked upon as a "senior citizen" in the Washington Community College fraternity. In any case, I am pleased to be here and to have an opportunity to have a part in this University sponsored conference.

I have watched the development of the community colleges in the state from the birch john days to the John Birch era. I have observed with interest the contribution of Drs. Tom Cole, Lloyd Elias, Vic Sievertz, Fred Giles, and so many others here present to this vital community college education. I have seen these institutions grow from what one of our educators described some years ago as carbuncular excrescents on the body of higher education to a position of academic status as evidenced by a statement that appeared in a brochure from the University of Washington in January of 1960 which stated:

> . . . the University of Washington believes that it could more effectively make its own contribution in higher education if communities were to undertake a gradual development of more and larger junior colleges on a sound educational base. Junior colleges could share increasingly with public and private four-year institutions the responsibility for freshmen and sophomores enrolled in college academic courses.

It would appear that the battles of old between the University and the junior colleges are a thing of the past. Dr. Richard Bailey, past president of Yakima Valley Community College, made the following statement just a year ago in analyzing the agonizing period when the University was tenaciously holding to the status quo and the junior colleges were feverishly beating the bushes for students. Dr. Bailey said:

> Fortunately, the short sighted brutality on the part of the University and on the part of the community colleges is seldom or never practiced in the enlightened period of educational amnesty in the state. I am told by old-timers that in the 'olden days' things were more brutal. There are some aged battlers on the community college campuses who still

look with suspicion on the University. I suspect that the University also has its ancient moulders who remember with nostalgia the old days. Let us give these punch drunk old faculty members only the courtesy due their age and infirmities and allow them no opportunity to move us backward over the pathways from which we have come.

Today there are 687 community-junior colleges in America serving 900,000 students, or approximately 25 per cent of all students attending college. Today in Washington there are thirteen community colleges serving 15,000 full time students and a total of 45,566 in the total program. The community colleges have a three-fold responsibility: first, to offer a good quality academic program toward a bachelor of arts or science degree; second, to offer technical and vocational training to both students who have high academic potential (but desire this type of preparation), and to those who are less gifted; and third, to give "general education" to those who desire a broadened general background so that they may live happier and more productive lives, and make a greater contribution to their society. Our particular interest here today is the first of these; namely, to offer a high quality academic transfer program so that those who complete this work might transfer to a senior, baccalaureate degree-granting institution without question.

The community colleges in Washington have come of age. We must agree with the Washington Education Association when they say that the function of the school is education, and although competent teachers are the most important factor in the education process, the effectiveness of the teaching, and of the student's learning, is determined in part by the beauty and convenience of their environment. Junior colleges throughout the nation have recognized this important fact and built their institutions accordingly. The capital investment in these colleges in the state of Washington today is well in excess of thirty million dollars, and each biennium finds the legislature earmarking millions additional for the establishment of new modern colleges, and additions to presently existing institutions.

What then is the transfer status of the community college in the state of Washington? It is reassuring to know that the 17,702 transfer students now in the Washington community colleges are in good hands. The administrators of these institutions, and the faculty, look upon these students with an element of pride and commitment; the senior colleges watch carefully as they recognize, and in a sense delegate, this essential lower division responsibility. The legislature, too, moves with caution as it permits this program to develop within the community colleges, and the senior college coaches watch in gleeful anticipation as they follow closely the academic and athletic progress of these "eggheads." (I would cite the University of

Southern California victory over Wisconsin in the Rose Bowl as an example of what can happen when junior college transfers make up their minds.) It is interesting to note the eighth recommendation of the Interim Committee of the legislature in that section that has to do with community colleges.

> Since the community college is preparing some students for upper-division work in four year institutions, and others for direct entry into earning a living, it is important to know to what extent it is meeting each of these objectives. At present, data on what happens to students after they leave a local college is insufficient. Securing this information on all ex-students is difficult and costly, yet it is so significant that the committee recommends taking the first step, namely, 'That the State Board of Education require the Community Colleges to keep detailed records on Community College transfers.'

Although it would be difficult to keep detailed records on all students who leave the community colleges, we have followed with considerable interest the accomplishments of our transfer students in the colleges in the state. In 1960 a study of these transfers at Washington State University found that the average student from all the community colleges in the state had a 2.581 entering grade point. These transfer students dropped an average of .4016 of a point the first semester. When comparing the entering grade point to that student's cumulative Washington State University GPA it was found that the average drop was only .2047. The report from one of the state colleges indicated that the average drop under similar circumstances (but with very limited sampling) was 0.20 the first quarter, and that by the end of the second quarter the student's grade-point average was only 0.10 less than his average in his first two years. It is interesting to note that a similar study at the University of Colorado involving junior college transfers shows a mean difference the first semester of 0.16, and at the time of graduation the difference was 0.10. A comparable study at Fresno State College in California shows a 0.20 drop among junior college transfers at the end of the first semester, and at the end of the senior year this was reduced to 0.10. The difference in the grade-point average of junior college transfers, according to the Medsker[1] study, was 0.13 at San Jose State College at the end of the first quarter, 0.44 at the University of Illinois, and 0.30 at the University of Texas. We may draw certain definite conclusions from these statistics: (1) that the average GPA of transfer students will drop from one to two tenths of a point by the end of the first quarter or semester of attendance, and (2) that this difference in GPA will tend to level off as the student progresses toward graduation.

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College, Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960).

The variations in the nature of the studies in the institutions studied, and the great differences among the institutions in the size of the groups studied, make it impossible to find accurate comparisons. The probable reasons for the drop in grade-point average the first quarter or semester, according to one of the reports, are (1) the adjustment the student must make in being away from home, in many cases, for the first time; (2) the frustrations he experiences in finding himself among almost complete strangers for the first time; and (3) the problems he faces in adjusting to a campus that is larger in size, a library that is more spacious, and a faculty that has less time for personal contact.

The retention rate of junior college transfers is surprisingly high in the senior colleges. In December of 1960 a study at Washington State University (using a 1957 group) indicated that out of 125 students who had transferred from the community colleges, 23 were ultimately dropped, 21 cancelled their enrollment voluntarily, 18 were still enrolled in the fall of 1960, and 63 had graduated. Of those who transferred, 65 per cent had either graduated or were still in school. At the University of Texas, in a similar study, 72 per cent remained through the senior year and 66 per cent graduated. A study at the University of Michigan in 1953-54 shows that the retention rate of junior college transfers was high, with 59 per cent graduating at the end of four semesters, and 80 per cent of the original group graduating at the end of eight semesters. The significant conclusion that can be drawn here is that transfer students seem to linger longer in the senior colleges before graduating. This is not surprising when it is realized that many of these students entered a junior college in the first place for economic reasons.

The number of transfer students in the senior colleges in the state is increasing. The University of Washington has indicated that 431 students transferred from the junior colleges to that institution in the fall of 1962. This report states that one in every three undergraduate students transferred from a post-high-school institution. Of the total enrolled at the University over 1000 attended Washington State community colleges prior to their transfer. Washington State University reported 245 for the fall of 1962, Central Washington State College, 249, Western Washington State College, 438, and Eastern Washington State College, 233 students. There was a significant total of 1596 transfer students from the community colleges to the state senior institutions during the fall quarter of 1962.

What can we look forward to in the future? No doubt we will experience a constant increase in the number of transfer students, resulting from an inevitable increase in total college enrollment. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars has estimated that there will be an increase of 269 per cent in the number of college age youth between the years 1960 and 1970. If we can assume that the same percentage of the students will enter college in the future that now enter, we are faced with serious problems. In 1900 only 4 per cent of the high school graduates entered college. Today 37 per cent enter, and it is expected that 50 per cent will attend by 1975. In view of these estimates I would predict the following:

1. That the Washington College Association, consisting of the presidents of the universities and colleges of the state, both junior and senior, public and private, will continue to work together to develop an acceptable philosophy of higher education that will accomplish a high caliber academic program, and guarantee a productive and progressive system of higher education in the state.

2. That the heads of colleges, schools and departments within the senior colleges and universities will continue to cooperate with the community colleges in order to coordinate academic programs and thus aid the student in his transfer program.

3. That the legislature and the State Board of Education will continue to approve additional community colleges, adequately housed, in order to meet the educational needs of the youth and adults of the state.

4. The development of more and better vocational-technical courses in an effort to meet the growing needs in the national economy, and more effectively utilize the nation's manpower.

5. That the teaching staffs of the community colleges will attract more and more highly qualified instructors, and an increasing number of student scholars, as they gain stature as professional institutions.

6. That the community colleges will be encouraged to offer more professional courses in such fields as education, and other professional areas, as the graduate schools increase in size, the universities confine themselves to the highly disciplined academic pursuits, and the state colleges assume responsibility for the giving of advanced degrees other than those in the field of education.

7. The emergence of a new approach in the administrative pattern in the community colleges within the state, operating within the framework of the common schools, but with an enlightened philosophy of higher education and a professional autonomy that will give these colleges the status that they deserve, and must have, if they are to fulfill their assigned role as institutions of higher learning.

CURRICULAR CHANGE AND THE TRANSFER STUDENT

William L. Phillips
Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Washington

One of the devices which Fred Giles used to prod those of us who are taking part in this morning's program into getting our speeches ready was to send us a transcript of the University-Junior College Conference of last February. As I thought over the remarks which I might make to you this morning, I found myself referring to an address given at last year's conference by a community college president on "Problems and Concerns of the Junior Colleges in Transfer Relations with the University." This speaker presented in his conclusion a consensus of the positions of community college administrators concerning the transfer student, headed by the following remark: "It is appropriate that the community colleges assume a strong position of leadership in any program change involving the lower division of college work. It is necessary that close cooperation between the lower divisions of the University and the community colleges takes place in any over-all revision or drastic experimentation with the lower division course pattern. The community colleges may eventually have the lion's share of the enrollment in this field and it is appropriate that they assume a strong position of leadership in any program of change contemplated."

Now I am sure that I could contribute to the happy atmosphere of this occasion by pledging the cooperation of the University faculty with the community college faculties in matters of curricular change. I might even make our lunch more pleasant if I suggested that we all ought to get together more often, and then sat down. If I did so, however, I would be false to the position of the University faculty as I understand it and to my own feeling, for I am frankly not very optimistic about bringing about such cooperation as last year's speaker proposed. Let me suggest to you some of the elements of life in a major state university college of arts and sciences which provide the network of limitations within which we operate.

First of all, the College of Arts and Sciences receives transfer students of one sort or another from hundreds of institutions ranging from Seattle high schools to Pakistani universities. While Dr. Giles constantly, and effectively, reminds us of the importance to the University of the transfer student, and specifically the junior college student, the number of students transferring into the College of Arts and Sciences from Washington State junior colleges each autumn is a relatively small amount of our entering population. Last autumn, 198 of our 2,820 new undergraduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences came from Washington State junior colleges. This junior college transfer population represented about 6.8 per cent, or 1 out of 16, of our new undergraduate students. If we include the graduate student in the category of "transfer student," as I think we must, I should point out that the College of Arts and Sciences last autumn had more than twice as many new graduate students as new students from Washington junior colleges. Curriculum planners in the College of Arts and Sciences, therefore, must be concerned with our relationships with the high schools, the junior colleges, the four-year colleges, and the graduate schools from which we receive transfer students, as well as those to whom we send transfer students.

Secondly, curriculum change in a university college of arts and sciences is a massive job even without the added burdens of consultation with agencies outside the university. No right is so dear to the faculty member of a university as the right to assist in the determination of the degree requirements of his students, unless it be the right to park within a block of his office. I do not mean that he gives it great thought, that he gathers evidence which would be meaningful to others, that he clarifies the preconceptions which he holds to, or even that he discusses it very much with his colleagues, but when a curricular question is raised he is likely to come forward with his prejudices hidden only to himself and demand a hand in controlling the destiny of these students. Into the arena of discussion he comes to meet others, armed with words like "general education," "liberal education," "creativity," "synthesis," "culture," "discipline," "values," and "needs," none of which mean the same to him as they mean to his colleagues. Whether it is wise for us to further complicate this process by involving representatives from the many institutions from which the university draws its students and to which it sends its students is at least debatable.

And if we should, as last year's speaker suggested, ask the community colleges to assume a strong position of leadership in curricular change, at what point should we seek that advice? For example, the College of Arts and Sciences inaugurated in autumn of 1962 a college-wide degree pattern which was the first major revision of the College's curriculum since 1935. Although to some people outside the College who heard of this change only a few months before it took effect its establishment might have seemed capricious, hasty, and arbitrary, let me assure you it was the result of long debate and copious bloodletting. It all began when a certain history professor arose in an Arts College faculty meeting in May, 1958, and asked for a review of the College requirements for the bachelor's degree. The following October, a committee of the faculty was appointed to survey the College requirements and to make recommendations, if necessary, for their change. After a year and a quarter of deliberations, fact finding, and investigation, that committee reported its findings to three meetings of the entire College faculty in February and March of 1960. When it appeared that the faculty could not agree upon the proposals of this faculty committee, and when it appeared that somewhat larger issues than degree requirements were involved (that is, the educational policy of the entire College), the Dean appointed a new committee on Educational Policy in May of that year with the charge of establishing the educational policy of the College, from which agreement upon the particulars of a bachelor's degree program might flow. The new committee worked through the summer of 1960, submitted a tentative draft of a new bachelor's program to the College in the autumn, 1960, and inaugurated a system of discussions with representatives of the thirty-five departments and schools of the College which continued through the fall of 1960 and the early winter of 1961. The revisions of the bachelor's degree program which resulted from these departmental conferences were presented to a gathering of eighty members of the College faculty on March 13 and 14, 1961, at a two-day session at the Pack Forest site of the College of Forestry, where the mountain air served to cool the tempers of the participants. After additional discussion and revision, the new requirements for the bachelor's program were presented to the entire faculty at two meetings in May, 1961, at which it was discovered that even yet there were segments of the faculty with strong objections to the new program. Nevertheless, with the end of the academic year approaching, and with the unlovely possibility of yet a third committee to be appointed, the issues were finally put to a vote, and on June 1, 1961, the Arts faculty voted in a ratio of 3 to 1 to accept the new requirements. During the following academic year, the details of the new program were worked out, and they were spelled out in the Arts and Sciences Bulletin published in September, 1962, and in a brochure given to new students entering the College that month.

I have gone through this recital of ancient woes not only to give you some indication of the seriousness with which the faculty takes matters of curricular change, but also to enable me to ask "at what point in these deliberations would it have been appropriate for the community colleges to have assumed a strong position of leadership in any program change involving the lower division of college work?" During the deliberations of the first committee? At the time of the faculty meetings in 1960? At the time that the second committee was instituted? At the time of the Pack Forest conference? At the time of the faculty debates in the May, 1961, meetings? Or when? I certainly do not mean to suggest that the needs of junior college transfer students were overlooked in the deliberations concerning the College degree program. At every point in the discussions, the relationship of the College to all the institutions which send us our students had to be considered. I am edging toward the statement that in the relationships which presently exist between the University and other institutions of higher learning within the state, the cooperation which we all desire will have to be cooperation not in the making of primary curricular decisions at the University, but rather in the establishment of newly changed curricula and in their possible revisions in the light of the experience of the transfer student. We shall, of course, be very glad to have your comments concerning the way in which the new degree program has affected the transfers from Washington junior colleges. Dean Walter Riley of our College has the greatest share of the initial contacts with transfer students in the College of Arts and Sciences and I am sure that he and his counterparts in other colleges will be glad to discuss these matters with you, as of course would Dr. Giles and others in the University.

Finally, I should like to express my belief that any truly effective cooperation among institutions affecting the transfer student must in the future be based upon a general understanding of the differences among institutions, their faculties, and their curricula. Students and their parents must be disillusioned of the idea that a bachelor's degree is awarded automatically for 180 credit hours, to be added up like dollars in the bank. Rather, a bachelor's degree is awarded on the completion of a course of study which has a particular character because of the nature of the institution which awards it, its faculties, its location, the students it typically attracts, and the training and orientation of its faculty. A bachelor's degree program in a college of arts and sciences in a large university, with a moderately rigorously selected undergraduate student body drawn largely from a metropolitan center and characterized by strong vocational intentions, with a large graduate population training to be researchers and scholars and teachers, and with a faculty of highly trained, research-oriented specialists is inevitably different from a bachelor's degree program in a small liberal arts college in a rural setting, with an unselected student body drawn from middle class families throughout a region, with no graduate program worthy of the name, and with a faculty of professors dedicated to teaching undergraduates but without the facilities or the encouragement to advance knowledge in their fields. I am not arguing that one will be better than the other, but merely that they will be different. They may even bring students to similar states of education after four years. The point simply is that students after two years will not be completely interchangeable, and they should not expect to be treated as though they were.

Some such considerations as these underlay our decision in the College of Arts and Sciences to exempt certain students transferring from Washington junior colleges from the new degree requirements established last fall, but to hold all other transfer students to the new pattern. We were honoring what we conceived of as an obligation to make the transition from junior colleges into our program as smooth as possible, since the junior colleges have accepted the obligation to prepare some of their students to continue in the curricula of the University as well as other four-year institutions in the state and elsewhere. We did not feel that we had quite the same obligation to students in other four-year institutions, who ought ideally to be submitting themselves to the internally coherent curricula patterns of the institutions they have chosen rather than using them as gentle springboards to the University.

In my opinion we must make clear to students and their parents the difference among institutions, to disillusion them of the notion that there is something called a "lower division" which has any real interchangeability among institutions, and to discourage transfers among institutions for trivial reasons. This obligation will be increased as various institutions modify their programs to accelerate the progress of those students especially well prepared in high school, to take advantage of developments in programmed instruction and independent study, and to amalgamate the undergraduate and graduate programs for special students who are identified early as bound for research or creative accomplishments in the arts and sciences. It will also be increased as some institutions change their character with changing numbers and quality of students and with increasing competition for qualified faculty. Only in such a context of better understanding among institutions, high school advisers, parents and students will we have an academic environment within the state that will minimize the effect upon the transfer student of curricular changes, when faculties can finally agree upon them.

ADMINISTRATION SESSION

A STUDY OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS TRANSFERRING FROM TWO- TO FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES:

SOME PRELIMINARY FINDINGS BASED ON A SAMPLE OF PARTICIPATING FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

Dorothy M. Knoell, Associate Research Psychologist
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley, California

Extensive data have been collected on approximately 8,000 students who transferred from two-year colleges to forty four-year colleges and universities in ten states in the fall of 1960. A sociological questionnaire containing ninety-nine items was first administered to these students. Transcripts were subsequently obtained for all students which indicate the grades on all work taken during the first two years after transfer, together with varying amounts of information about high school and junior college performance. Students who withdrew before graduation or who were dismissed after transfer were requested to complete an additional questionnaire which sought information concerning the circumstances leading to their withdrawal and their plans for the future. Interviews were conducted with approximately 350 students who were still enrolled in their fourth semester (or fifth or sixth quarter) after transfer.

As a means of comparing the record of transfer students with that of native students, a sample of native students at each of the participating four-year colleges was drawn in the spring of 1962 from the rosters of baccalaureate degree candidates. The sample was equal in number to the number of junior college transfer students expecting to graduate in June and distributed in the same proportions among the major fields of study as were the transfer students. A brief biographical questionnaire was administered to the native students during their final term of study. Also, full transcripts of four-year college work were obtained for these students following their graduation in the spring.

Interviews were conducted with various staff members at each of the four-year colleges in order to gain information about policies pertaining to and attitudes and opinions toward transfer students. Bulletins of information, orientation materials, unpublished studies, and other materials were collected for each institution for use in interpreting findings concerning transfer student performance. Also, an attempt was made to attend one or more meetings in each of the ten states which was devoted to problems of articulation and coordination in the transfer from two-year to four-year colleges, and to talk with personnel concerned with these problems.

The main areas of investigation are the following:

A. Analysis of biographical and sociological data to answer the following major questions:

    1. What are the characteristics of students who attend a two-year college before transferring to a four-year college?

    2. What kind of planning was done by transfer students from two-year colleges, with respect to original choice of college, pattern of attendance and transfer, choice of major, career, goals, etc.?

    3. What is the record of participation of transfer students in extracurricular and leisure time activities in high school, junior college, and after transfer? What is their attitude toward participation and leadership by transfer students?

    4. How do transfer students evaluate their experience at the two-year and four-year colleges in the areas of instruction, student personnel services, grading, student competition, etc.? Do the evaluations vary with the degree of success attained in the first term after transfer? With the junior college attended? With the four-year college?

B. Analysis of data collected on the sample of native students graduating in June, 1962, in the following major areas:

    1. Socioeconomic characteristics;
    2. Planning for college and career;
    3. Participation in extracurricular activities;
    4. Evaluation of instructional and student personnel services.

C. Analysis of data pertaining to the performance and enrollment problems of transfer students to provide the following information:

    1. Quality of junior college performance in relation to performance after transfer;

2. Extent of and reasons for loss of credit in transfer from the two-year college;
3. Term-by-term quality of performance after transfer;
4. Incidence of probation, warning, dismissal and reinstatement, and dismissal without reinstatement;
5. Incidence of honors by term and at graduation;
6. Incidence of graduation, by term;
7. Patterns of enrollment after transfer, e.g., broken vs. consecutive, summer sessions, correspondence and extension enrollment, credit by examination.

D. Analysis of the transcripts for the sample of native students, to provide information comparable to that obtained for the transfer students.

E. Comparison of the experience and performance of native and transfer students who completed their degree requirements in the spring term, 1962, controlling appropriate background variables.

F. Analysis of questionnaire responses given by students who withdrew or were dismissed after transfer, before they completed their degree programs, in the following areas:

1. Self-report of the circumstances and events leading to their withdrawal or dismissal;
2. Expectations concerning re-enrollment or transfer to another institution;
3. Report of involvement of family, friends, college staff, and others in the decision to withdraw (if voluntary);
4. Activity during the term after withdrawal or dismissal (employment, education elsewhere, etc.);
5. Reasons given for withdrawing and/or failing after transfer from the two-year college.

A few preliminary findings concerning the characteristics and performance of students transferring to the University of Washington and a sample of other four-year institutions are contained in the following tables.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER GROUP, COMPARED WITH NATIONAL SAMPLE*

Table 1
Sex

Sex	UW group		Total group	
	N	%	N	%
Men	269	80	1841	72
Women	69	20	731	28
Total	338	--	2572	--

Table 2
Pattern of College Attendance Before Transfer

Pattern		Men		Women		Total	
		UW	Total	UW	Total	UW	Total
Junior College (only)	N	244	1673	59	689	303	2362
	%	91	91	86	94	90	92
Other Four-Year College Than Junior College	N	22	124	9	34	31	158
	%	8	7	13	5	9	6
Other Patterns	N	3	44	1	8	4	52
	%	1	2	1	1	1	2

Table 3
Age at Time of Transfer

Age		Men		Women		Total	
		UW	Total	UW	Total	UW	Total
20 or under	N	127	1014	52	585	179	1599
	%	47	55	75	80	53	62
21 - 25	N	93	671	10	105	103	776
	%	35	36	15	14	30	30
26 - 30	N	44	126	6	19	50	145
	%	16	7	9	3	15	6
31 - 40	N	5	24	0	17	5	41
	%	2	1	0	2	2	2
over 40	N	0	6	1	5	1	11
	%	0	+	1	1	+	+

* Fall 1960 transfers to a sample of 20 four-year institutions (half of study group) in seven states.

Table 4
Status at the End of the First Term After Transfer*

Status		Men		Women		Total	
		UW	Total	UW	Total	UW	Total
In School:							
GPA = C or Better	N	185	928	45	388	230	1316
	%	69	58	65	68	68	61
Probation	N	53	252	12	81	65	333
	%	20	16	17	14	19	15
GPA Below C, No Probation	N	14	238	3	46	17	284
	%	5	15	4	8	5	13
Dismissed and Reinstated	N	0	21	0	2	0	23
	%	0	1	0	+	0	1
Total	N	252	1439	60	517	312	1956
	%	94	90	87	91	92	90
Withdrew:							
GPA = C or Better	N	3	30	1	15	4	45
	%	1	2	1	3	1	2
GPA Below C	N	12	89	8	30	20	119
	%	5	5	12	5	6	5
No Grades	N	2	33	0	7	2	40
	%	+	2	0	1	+	2
Total	N	17	152	9	52	26	204
	%	6	10	13	9	8	10

* Sample of students in 15 four-year colleges in six states.

Table 5
End of Study (June 1962) Status of Fall 1960 Transfers from Junior College to the University of Washington

Status		Junior College GPA					Total
		2.00-2.24	2.25-2.49	2.50-2.74	2.75-2.99	3.00+ better	
Graduated	N	9	2	15	15	28	69
	%	20	3	22	29	28	21
Still Enrolled							
GPA Above C	N	8	24	26	16	53	127
GPA Below C	N	2	1	2	0	0	5
Total	N	10	25	28	16	53	132
	%	23	41	42	31	53	41
Withdrew Voluntarily							
GPA Above C	N	2	8	6	8	12	36
GPA Below C	N	6	7	3	5	2	23
Total	N	8	15	9	13	14	59
	%	18	25	13	25	14	18
Dismissed	N	17	19	14	7	5	62
	%	39	31	21	14	5	19
Total: Withdrew Below C and Dismissed	N	23	26	17	12	7	85
	%	52	43	25	24	7	26
Total	N	44	61	68	51	100	324
	%	14	19	21	16	31	--

Table 6

UW Grade-Point Averages Earned by Transfers In Relation to Junior College Grades and End-of-Study Status

Mean GPA	Junior College GPA					
	2.00-2.24	2.25-2.49	2.50-2.74	2.75-2.99	3.00+ Over	Total
Grads: N	9	2	15	15	28	69
JC Total	2.14	2.38	2.63	2.86	3.42	2.93
UW Total	2.53	3.00	2.61	2.72	3.03	2.80
Term 1	2.06	2.52	2.56	2.55	2.86	2.61
Term 2	2.37	2.44	2.66	2.62	2.99	2.74
Term 3	2.60	3.03	2.65	2.67	2.93	2.77
In School:N	10	25	27	16	54	132
JC Total	2.14	2.41	2.62	2.83	3.42	2.90
UW Total	2.22	2.39	2.46	2.54	2.85	2.60
Term 1	2.24	2.19	2.20	2.37	2.78	2.47
Term 2	2.22	2.49	2.32	2.38	2.74	2.53
Term 3	2.17	2.39	2.42	2.44	2.83	2.57
Drop-outs:						
N*	8-6	16-12	10-6	13-6	14-6	61-36
JC Total	2.14	2.35	2.63	2.87	3.26	2.69
UW Total	1.76	1.78	1.96	2.09	2.52	2.08
Term 1	1.90	2.00	2.02	2.32	2.79	2.20
Term 2	2.14	2.01	1.93	2.34	2.71	2.21
Term 3	1.71	2.02	2.26	2.25	2.45	2.12
Dismissals:						
N*	17-8	19-15	14-6	7-4	5-2	62-35
JC Total	2.11	2.36	2.58	2.91	3.06	2.46
UW Total	1.24	1.37	1.35	1.49	1.47	1.35
Term 1	1.36	1.48	1.60	1.61	1.38	1.48
Term 2	1.47	1.43	1.35	1.42	1.61	1.44
Term 3	1.49	1.42	1.76	1.54	1.50	1.51
Total N*	44-33	62-54	66-54	51-41	101-90	324-272
JC Total	2.13	2.38	2.62	2.86	3.38	2.78
UW Total	1.82	1.94	2.18	2.38	2.79	2.31
Term 1	1.82	1.92	2.16	2.31	2.73	2.27
Term 2	1.96	2.03	2.17	2.30	2.75	2.32
Term 3	2.04	2.06	2.39	2.41	2.81	2.42

* First N is the number of students at the time of transfer who completed at least one term. Second N is the number of students who completed at least three terms. "UW Total" GPA is the cumulative average which is based on varying amounts of work at the University, depending upon the date of withdrawal or dismissal.

Table 7
End of Study Status

Four-Year College		Total	Graduates		Still in School		Drop-outs		Dismissals	
		N	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universities: (like UW)	1	266	55	28	118	44	57	21	36	14
	2	192	37	19	78	41	37	19	40	21
	3	255	85	33	89	35	44	17	37	14
	4	292	152	52	79	27	48	17	13	4
Universities: (like WSU)	1	155	37	33	66	42	21	14	31	20
	2	99	35	35	38	38	17	17	9	9
	3	194	113	58	41	21	21	11	19	10
	4	233	149	64	50	21	23	10	11	5
State Colleges: (like WWSC)	1	123	53	54	40	32	14	11	16	13
	2	194	84	44	60	31	25	13	25	13
	3	98	70	71	14	14	13	13	1	1
	4	53	25	47	19	36	3	6	6	11

* Percentage is based on the number of students admitted with junior standing.

SOME STATISTICS ON JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Address by Dr. Robert E. Guild
Coordinator, Institutional Educational Research
University of Washington

Dr. Guild opened his remarks by thanking the committee for giving him the opportunity to share with the participants of the Junior College Conference the statistics they had been working with in the Office of Institutional Educational Research.

He pointed out that he was not trying to give a complete statistical description of Junior College transfers, but was offering statistics already gathered as examples of statistical descriptions which might be useful. He emphasized that the purpose of the session on administration was to initiate plans for statistical work which would be administratively useful in the future, and that the collection of useful statistics would require careful planning well in advance of administrative demand.

Figures and charts distributed to the group are incorporated in the minutes of this session, for they are the basis of the question and discussion period conducted by Dr. Guild.

Dr. Guild pointed out the number of undergraduate students transferring to the University of Washington for the past five years from junior college and four-year institutions was as follows:

	Autumn 1958		Autumn 1959		Autumn 1960		Autumn 1961		Autumn 1962	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
From Junior College	327	62	334	101	382	98	392	121	367	158
From Four-Year College	458	270	415	339	379	379	356	375	394	465
Total	785	332	749	440	761	477	748	496	761	623

High school grade-point averages of male junior college transfers entering 1958, 1959, 1960 compared with high school grade-point averages of male freshmen entering directly from high school in 1958, 1959, and 1960 were:

	High School Grade Point Average			
Per Cent of Males in High School GPA Interval	Less Than 2.50	2.50-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50-4.00
Transfers from Junior College	43.7%	35.0%	16.8%	09.5%
Entering from High School	27.0%	34.0%	27.0%	12.0%

Junior college grade-point averages of male students transferring in 1958, 1959, and 1960 were:

	Junior College Grade-Point Average							
	Less Than 2.50		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number and Per Cent of Male Junior College Transfers in Junior College GPA Interval	309	38.8	278	35.0	134	16.8	76	09.5

Correlations between junior college grade-point averages and University of Washington grade-point averages, and between high school grade-point averages and University of Washington grade-point averages for male junior college transfers entering 1958, 1959, and 1960 were:

	Correlations			
	H.S. GPA and 1st Qtr. UW	H.S. GPA and Cum. UW	J.C. GPA and 1st Qtr. UW	J.C. GPA and Cum. UW
All Male Junior College Transfers	.51	.55	.34	.34
Entering as Freshmen	.32	.33	.13	.19
Entering as Sophomores	.47	.50	.35	.30
Entering as Juniors	.55	.56	.39	.40

The correlation between first quarter University of Washington GPA and Cumulative University of Washington GPA is .83 for all male junior college transfers entering 1958, 1959, and 1960.

Dr. Guild pointed out the relationship between junior college grade-point average and first-quarter and cumulative University of Washington grade-point averages: the per cent of students entering autumn, 1958, 1959, and 1960 from junior colleges falling into the various first-quarter and cumulative University of Washington grade-point average intervals was as follows:

		Entering Junior College GPA Category							
		2.50 and Below		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
	UW GPA Category	First Quarter UW GPA	Cumulative UW GPA	First Quarter UW GPA	Cumulative UW GPA	First Quarter UW GPA	Cumulative UW GPA	First Quarter UW GPA	Cumulative UW GPA
Per Cent in UW GPA Category	Below 2.00	53.8%	54.9%	33.0%	31.4%	15.4%	17.6%	05.0%	03.0%
	2.00-2.49	33.4%	29.6%	40.7%	41.2%	30.2%	25.3%	09.9%	07.9%
	2.50-2.99	08.4%	13.4%	17.9%	21.5%	23.6%	35.7%	12.9%	25.7%
	3.00-3.49	03.2%	02.0%	07.1%	05.2%	26.4%	19.2%	49.5%	40.6%
	3.50-4.00	01.2%	00.0%	01.2%	00.6%	04.4%	02.2%	22.8%	22.8%
		100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%

The relationship between junior college grade-point average and first quarter and cumulative University of Washington grade-point average: the median first-quarter and cumulative University of Washington grade-point averages of students entering from junior colleges autumn, 1959, 1960, and 1961 is:

JC GPA Category	Number of Students		First Quarter Median UW GPA		Cumulative Median UW GPA	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
2.00-2.49	298	34	1.89	2.06	1.93	1.81
2.50-2.99	277	47	2.19	2.26	2.20	2.32
3.00-3.49	133	49	2.56	2.64	2.55	2.72
3.50-4.00	70	31	3.17	3.11	3.14	3.19

Relationship of high school grade-point average to progress of male junior college transfers entering autumn, 1958, was:

	High School Grade-Point Average							
	Less Than 2.50		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
Number in GPA Category	103		65		49		23	
	No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students	
Actions								
On Probation at Least Once	63	61.2%	32	49.2%	14	28.6%	8	34.8%
Dropped by Dean's Action*	37	35.9%	12	18.5%	2	04.1%	3	13.0%
Withdrew One or More Times	39	37.9%	23	35.4%	17	34.7%	8	34.8%
Status Autumn Quarter 1962								
Dropped and Not Readmitted	33	32.0%	6	09.2%	3	06.1%	1	04.3%
Withdrawn	22	21.4%	14	21.6%	9	18.3%	5	21.7%
In School (No Degree)	1	01.0%	7	10.8%	2	04.1%	1	04.3%
Graduated	47	45.6%	38	58.5%	33	67.3%	16	69.6%

* Some students dropped were readmitted.

Relationship of junior college grade-point average to progress of male junior college transfers entering autumn, 1958, was:

			Junior College Grade-Point Average							
	Less Than 2.00		2.00-2.49		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
Number in GPA Category	3		95		86		38		19	
Actions	No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students	
On Probation at Least Once	3	100.0%	65	68.4%	41	47.7%	6	15.8%	3	15.8%
Dropped by Dean's Action*	2	66.7%	37	38.9%	14	16.3%	2	05.3%	1	05.3%
Withdrew One or More Times	1	33.3%	35	36.8%	38	44.2%	10	26.3%	4	21.1%
Status Autumn Quarter 1962										
Dropped and Not Readmitted	1	33.3%	30	31.6%	11	12.8%	1	02.6%	0	00.0%
Withdrawn	0	00.0%	22	23.2%	21	24.4%	6	15.8%	1	05.3%
In School (No Degree)	1	33.3%	6	06.3%	4	04.7%	0	00.0%	1	05.3%
Graduated	1	33.3%	37	38.9%	49	57.0%	30	78.9%	17	89.5%

* Some students dropped were readmitted.

Relationship of high school grade-point average to progress of male junior college transfers entering autumn, 1959, was:

	High School Grade-Point Average							
	Less Than 2.50		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
Number in GPA Category	112		74		44		24	
Actions	No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students	
On Probation at Least Once	73	65.2%	42	56.8%	21	47.7%	6	25.0%
Dropped by Dean's Action*	44	39.3%	25	33.8%	10	22.7%	2	08.3%
Withdrew One or More Times	45	40.2%	28	37.8%	12	27.3%	9	37.5%
Status Autumn Quarter 1962								
Dropped and Not Readmitted	33	29.5%	18	24.3%	8	18.2%	1	04.2%
Withdrawn	31	27.7%	16	21.7%	5	11.3%	3	12.5%
In School (No Degree)	11	09.8%	10	13.5%	8	18.2%	3	12.5%
Graduated	36	32.1%	29	39.2%	23	52.3%	17	70.8%

* Some students dropped were readmitted.

Relationship of junior college grade-point average to progress of male junior college transfers entering autumn, 1959, was:

			Junior College Grade-Point Average							
	Less Than 2.00		2.00-2.49		2.50-2.99		3.00-3.49		3.50-4.00	
Number in GPA Category	7		102		85		41		19	
Actions	No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students		No. & Pct. of Students	
On Probation at Least Once	7	100.0%	78	76.5%	42	49.4%	16	39.0%	0	00.0%
Dropped by Dean's Action*	5	71.4%	47	46.1%	22	25.9%	7	17.1%	0	00.0%
Withdrew One or More Times	1	14.3%	41	40.2%	31	36.5%	16	39.0%	4	21.1%
Status Autumn Quarter 1962										
Dropped and Not Readmitted	4	57.1%	34	33.3%	18	21.2%	4	09.8%	0	00.0%
Withdrawn	1	14.3%	28	27.4%	16	18.9%	8	19.5%	2	10.5%
In School (No Degree)	2	28.6%	11	10.8%	10	11.8%	8	19.5%	1	05.3%
Graduated	0	00.0%	29	28.4%	39	45.9%	21	51.2%	16	84.2%

* Some students dropped were readmitted.

Performance at the University of Washington of male transfers from junior colleges who had earned high school grade-point averages below 2.50:

26 veterans and 21 nonveterans
Number entering Autumn, 1958: 106
Number earning UW baccalaureate: 47 (44 per cent of 106)
Mean age at entrance to UW of the 47 students earning degree: 22 years
Mean years (at UW entrance) since high school graduation: 4.7 years

UW Grade-Point Performance:

3.00 or above
5 students (4 veterans and 1 nonveteran)
Years between high school and UW: 7, 4, 9, 9, 6 (mean: 7 years)

2.75-2.99
4 students (3 veterans and 1 nonveteran)
Years between high school and UW: 8, 6, 5, 1* (mean: 5 years)

2.50-2.75
11 students (6 veterans and 5 nonveterans)
Years between high school and UW: 8, 7, 7, 6, 6, 6, 5, 5, 5, 2†, 2**(mean: 5.4 years)

2.25-2.49
12 students (8 veterans and 4 nonveterans)
Years between high school and UW: 14, 8, 7, 6, 6, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 2, 1††(mean 5.3 years)

2.00-2.24 (9 of the 15 students in this interval were below 2.10 UW GPA)
15 students (5 veterans and 10 nonveterans)
Years between high school and UW: 8, 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1 (mean: 3.1 years)

Discussion

Although the data presented here do not permit all desirable comparisons, they do suggest a relationship between an interruption in schooling (service or work experience) and UW performance, and, of course, between age and UW performance.

---

* Junior College GPA: 3.16
† Junior College GPA: 3.58
** Junior College GPA: 2.63
†† This man was 25 years old at high school graduation.

Sixteen of the forty-seven students in this study were 21 years old or younger at entrance to UW. Of these sixteen, ten were in the 2.00-2.49 UW GPA interval, three were in the 2.25-2.49 interval, and three earned UW GPA's above 2.50.

If we accept more than two years between high school graduation and UW entrance as a crude indicator of interrupted schooling, then we find that of the thirty-two students earning UW GPA's above 2.25, only five had not interrupted their schooling.

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE SESSION

Chairman: Jeanette Poore
Dean of Students
Everett Junior College

Miss Poore opened the meeting by distributing an agenda which would be followed in the counseling discussion. She expressed her hope that the discussion would be informal, indicating that Dr. Giles had invited personnel from the University to attend the session who were concerned with topics listed on the agenda.

Eugene Smith, Director of Advanced Placement, William Irmscher, Director of Freshman English, and Maurice Kingston, Professor of Mathematics, were in attendance to answer any questions concerning the Advanced Placement Program. Mr. Smith recommended the brochure entitled "Advanced Placement: Program and Policies at the University of Washington," which describes and explains the program in detail. The following statements summarize the discussion:

1. Ninety-nine per cent of advanced placement concerns high school students. The main idea of the program is that first-year college work will be completed in the twelfth year of high school.

2. In terms of the transfer student whose exemption from coursework on the junior college level is indicated by a given grade and recorded on the transcript, the University will honor the grade. If the exemption is recorded as "exempt," the student is referred to the department concerned for determination of credit; each exemption as such is treated as an individual case. If junior colleges would record a grade rather than "exempt" no decision would be necessary by the University.

3. English placement at the present time is as follows:
   (a) A score of 163 or better on the precollege test--1 quarter exempt, 2 quarters Honors English required, and
   (b) Students enrolled in regular English courses who achieve a grade of "B" or better in both English 101 and 102--exempt from 103.

4. Students are instructed when they first enter the University to check with departments and assure themselves that requirements have been fulfilled.

5. There is advanced placement in mathematics but the standards are high and only a few candidates qualify. However,

Advanced Placement is discouraged in the Department of Mathematics because it disqualifies students from the honors program, which is considered the most valuable sequence for mathematics majors.

6. Few English exemptions are granted from the junior colleges. The experience has been that students who would qualify for English exemptions prefer to carry the whole sequence.

Miss Poore raised the issue of effective counseling for nonhigh school graduates who return to school after long absences--should they be encouraged to complete a high school program or attempt to gain admission under special classification? It was pointed out that scores on the GED test given by the military services are accepted as an indication of probable success at the college level, but not in lieu of specific high school subjects such as algebra, geometry, chemistry, and the like. Deficiencies, especially in mathematics, foreign language, and English requirements should be made up before application for admission.

Dean Riley explained that the brochure entitled "Information for Entering Students, the Bachelor's Degree," which outlines the new program in the College of Arts and Sciences, is temporarily unavailable. The revised edition is on order, and will be available sometime in May. Copies can then be obtained from the College Relations Office or from the Central Advisory Office, Arts and Sciences. The new program in Arts and Sciences, in relation to junior college transfer students, can be confined within the following schedule: (1) Students attending junior colleges in 1962 and after will be expected to meet the new requirements for degree when they transfer to the University, and (2) students attending junior colleges prior to 1962 will be held for the old requirements in Arts and Sciences.

Dean Riley, Arts and Sciences, Vernon Hammer, Engineering, and Willamay Pym, Business Administration, briefly outlined the advisory programs in their respective colleges. Each emphasized that an adviser was available at all times for both high school and transfer students seeking help or information about the particular college.

The consensus seemed to be that academic advising of transfer students continues to be unsatisfactory, although it was agreed that a good deal of progress has been made during the past five years. From the interviews conducted on the previous day these observations were made by junior college personnel:

1. Students were completely satisfied with advising services provided in the Colleges of Forestry, Engineering, and

Arts and Sciences. Transfer students interviewed by representatives from one junior college indicated unanimous dissatisfaction with the advising program in the College of Education; mainly, students rarely saw the same adviser twice.

2. Some students indicated that the program in engineering, whereby graduate students were available for direction and help to the transfer students, was extremely beneficial. Some students indicated their dissatisfaction with graduate students teaching freshman composition courses; there seemed to be disorganization and lack of interest displayed by graduate students in this area.

3. One student felt his placement in mathematics was out of order. He was enrolled in beginning calculus with no intervening college mathematics between high school and the calculus course.

At this point the meeting was adjourned.

ADMISSIONS-REGISTRATION SESSION

After a brief discussion of the CEEB Advanced Placement Program, it seemed apparent that advanced credit granted by a college on the basis of a CEEB Advanced Placement Examination would be acceptable in transfer to most colleges. Certainly this would be the case in transfer to the University provided the student achieved a score of 3, 4, or 5 on the Advanced Placement Examination. Mr. Adams was of the opinion that some question might be raised in regard to the acceptance of credits given on the basis of scores of 1 or 2 on the examination.

Individuals present seemed aware that validation of some kind might be expected in transferring credits earned through an examination prepared and given by the student's first college.

Mr. Adams explained that a high school diploma in itself does not qualify for admission to the University, nor does the lack of one preclude admission to a mature student who has demonstrated in some other way his qualifications to undertake University studies.

In general, the University supports the secondary schools and community colleges in encouraging all students to qualify for the high school diploma. When the diploma has been earned through a cooperative arrangement in which community college credits are applied toward the completion of high school units, the University accepts this arrangement at face value. Since credits may not apply at both levels, such a student may be exempted but not given University credit for community college work applied toward the diploma.

Mature nonhigh school graduates of 21 years or older who apply for admission to the University are expected to take the Washington Pre-College Test as a means of determining their readiness to undertake University study. Few students in this category score well enough on the test to justify immediate admission to the University and they are, therefore, referred to Edison Technical School, to a community college, or to the Division of Evening Classes for further preparation.

Since adequate preparation in mathematics and English is mandatory for University admission, students should be urged to enroll first in Elementary Algebra, Plane Geometry, Remedial English and/or Reading as necessary. At this point it should be clear whether or not the student is college material. If so, he should be advised to continue with a laboratory science, a foreign language of his own choosing, English Composition, and other solid courses.

A nonhigh school graduate who has done well in a year or two at a community college should be ready for consideration as a "special" student by the University's Board of Admissions. A student so admitted, will have his status changed to that of a "regular" student when he has proved himself through successful work at the University. This should not take long for a community college graduate.

The University no longer requires students to take courses without credit. However, the lack of adequate preparation may require the student to spend a quarter or two beyond the minimum four years in meeting degree requirements.

The University does not accept a diploma earned through the American School at face value because it does not represent work comparable to that completed in residence at an accredited high school. Validation of work earned in this way is required through tests and perhaps evening class enrollment at the University. On the other hand, a diploma earned through the University of Nebraska's Correspondence Program or that of another fully accredited institution is accepted at face value.

Community college representatives discussed problems presented by foreign applicants and were agreed that few should be encouraged.

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENTAL MEETING

Associate Dean F. Haydn Williams, College of Business Administration, opened the conference by stating that its purpose was to promote a free exchange of views and ideas in order to build a better bridge of understanding between the University of Washington and the junior colleges throughout the state. He then introduced Dean Grimshaw, who welcomed the visitors and expressed the hope that the conference would be mutually useful--indicating that the proceedings should be in the form of open discussion and not a series of presentations by members of the University of Washington faculty.

Associate Dean Kermit Hanson of the Graduate Study Office of the College, gave a progress report on some of the changes that have been taking place since the new undergraduate curriculum went into effect Autumn Quarter, 1962. He gave a brief history of the growth and development of colleges of business administration and reviewed some of the problems still facing them. He said that the College of Business Administration at the University of Washington is still in the process of phasing in its new program. For example, during 1961-62 students were required to complete only the first two courses in the three-course mathematics sequence of Math. 155, 156, and 157. Entering students in 1962-63 are required to complete all three courses for the full nine credits. Implementation of the Economics 202-203 six-credit sequence has been deferred until 1963-64, since Math. 157 is a prerequisite for Economics 202. The implementation of the mathematics, economics, and other lower-division requirements will make possible the partial upgrading of upper-division courses commencing in 1963-64. The first graduates under the fully implemented new curriculum will receive their degrees in 1965-66.

Dr. Hanson felt that graduates of this new program will have a higher order of analytical ability, a greater degree of organizational skill, a greater capacity to deal with the external environment of business, and more ability to cope with rapid change. These objectives may be more fully realized if the college works in closer partnership with junior colleges in the state. The junior colleges will be sending to the University an increasing number of transfer students, and Dr. Hanson expressed hope that problems concerning transfer students might be eased by continuing discussions between the University and the junior colleges.

Dean Williams next introduced Mr. Darryl Crait from Grays Harbor Junior College. Mr. Crait spoke about basic problems as they relate to junior college relations with the University of Washington. On the basis of a questionnaire sent out to the thirteen junior colleges, a summary was made by Mr. Crait of these basic concerns:

1. The junior colleges feel they cannot teach a five-hour statistics course in three hours as does the University; currently, five credits of statistics in a junior college receive three credits in statistics at the University, plus two business administration "X" credits. A three-credit junior college course, however, would not suffice at all other four-year colleges. More uniformity is needed.

2. The course in business law is offered for five- or ten-credit hours in junior colleges and three-credit hours at the University. When transferring to the University, students are required to take a course that is prerequisite to the course (business law) they have already had. In addition, junior colleges have difficulty finding suitable instructors with the legal background necessary to meet the University requirements for the course. Experience has shown that even when such instructors are available, these arrangements are usually unsatisfactory.

3. Junior colleges are not clear as to what content is included in the University's course in elementary accounting. Aside from conflicting ideas in teaching the managerial approach, the junior colleges have no confidence that the courses they are currently offering will prepare their students for the second year of accounting when they transfer to the University.

4. There is as little uniformity between the junior colleges with regard to objectives, as there is between the University of Washington, Washington State University, and Seattle University. This lack of unity is due, in part, to the increasing number of junior colleges and the fact that they operate under different school boards, different presidents, and even different P.-T.A.'s.

5. The quality of students in junior colleges and the University is not comparable. The distribution grade point is different in the junior colleges since they operate under a nonselective admissions policy. The junior colleges feel, however, that they have some very good students, fully able to go on to a four-year program, whom they would like to prepare as well as possible.

6. Junior colleges would like to be able to offer their students courses such as Money and Banking, Financial Institutions, Marketing, and courses in International Business. Since these courses are upper-division at the University, the junior college student cannot transfer them as direct equivalent credit.

7. The course numbering system is different in different colleges; yet, credits are transferred basically according to number. The question was raised as to why transferability cannot be based on course content and quality of instruction rather than number or level.

8. Transfer credit policy is not communicated soon enough so that the junior colleges can plan ahead. Because of the limited size of their staffs and smaller student registration, the junior colleges are unable to switch courses quickly. They need more time to plan and more specific information on exactly what the University respects in the way of course content. They are unable to tell their mathematics departments, for example, what type of courses to teach because of the uncertainty of the University requirements.

9. The junior colleges are in a position to provide as adequate a first two years of college as the four-year institutions are. They would like to be given the increasing opportunity to perform this service.

Some possible approaches to these areas of concern were offered:

1. That the University and the College of Business Administration consider the junior colleges as an important part of education for business and respect the concern of these institutions for quality education.

2. That the University adopt a more flexible policy in evaluating particular situations, particular colleges, and particular students; in addition, that it give consideration to course content and instruction even though course numbers do not correspond.

3. That more specific information be sent to the junior colleges regarding desired courses of action to be taken by them; these institutions are willing to follow the lead of the University, but they need to know more specifically what is needed and required.

Mr. Crait concluded by thanking the College for the opportunity to make the above remarks. They were made in the interest of cooperative, quality education for business, not as a criticism of the University of Washington.

Dean Williams then introduced a University of Washington panel consisting of Prof. Julius Roller, Chairman of the Accounting, Finance and Statistics Department; Prof. Sumner Marcus, Chairman of the General Business Department; and George Brabb, Associate Professor of Statistics. Each member made a few brief opening remarks.

Professor Roller expressed his sympathy for the small institutions with limited staff, and the dual function of teaching the terminal and the transfer student. He assured their representatives that the College of Business Administration would try to cooperate in every sense. He listed what is being done in the basic accounting courses which presently emphasize the managerial aspects of accounting. He explained the third basic accounting course, its function and reason for being.

Professor Marcus then explored some of the changes that have been made in the business law curriculum. He recognized the fact that they do not appear to be entirely logical, but suggested that there are good historical reasons for them. When the changes in curriculum were considered by the College, sufficient consideration may not have been given to the effect of these changes on the junior colleges and the transfer students in that the course in law traditionally given by the junior colleges was moved to the 300 level (becoming 301) and was thus not eligible for transfer credit, whereas the course put at the 200 level (201) had never been offered by the junior colleges. One possible solution was to put Business Law 201 at the 300 level. But this would have eliminated the junior college entirely from the law program. A second possible solution was to bring the second course, 301, to the 200 level and to offer both courses in junior college. A third was to continue to accept the contract course traditionally offered in the junior colleges, but to require the student to take the new Business Law 201 when he came to the University of Washington. This last, although superficially illogical, seemed to meet best the needs of the situation. Accordingly, Business Law 301 was renumbered Business Law 202 and it was contemplated that, in general, Business Law 201 would be offered only by the University.

With regard to the question of the qualification for the teaching of business law, it is true that traditionally business law has been taught in some junior colleges, universities and high schools by nonlawyers. This College for many years has considered that the law background is a necessary requirement for the business law teacher. While it does not propose to change existing arrangements in this regard, it must question new courses offered by nonlawyers.

Professor Brabb spoke with regard to statistics. He felt that the basic concept has already been stated to increase the managerial aspects of the University's program in statistics. This movement is not confined to the University of Washington in that business statistics courses generally are moving away from purely descriptive statistics to more of a managerial type.

Professor Roller, acting as moderator, called for any comments or remarks. The following remarks were made:

1. It is felt that the present accounting courses are too accelerated for the freshman and sophomore student who will be working in the small accounting firm, or who may want only a junior college education. Professor Roller explained that the University courses in accounting are following the general trend toward greater assistance to management. Another factor is that very often the brighter students have been repelled by immersing them in procedural detail. He felt that rather substantial changes are being made in accounting training, and made reference to the recent work that has come out from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

2. A representative from Western Washington State College commented on the change in their curriculum starting next year in the direction of requiring more work in math. He stated that they hoped that junior colleges could induce their students to take a college algebra course and possibly a beginning calculus course before transferring to Western, since one of the serious transfer problems is that students must have sixty upper-division credits to graduate. If, as transfers, they have to go back and take the basic courses in preparation for upper-division courses at Western, it creates a real difficulty for both the student and the College.

3. It was asked if there would be any serious objection to the junior colleges continuing the ten hours in accounting, if the managerial aspects are integrated into the program, even though the latter part is more concerned with basic analysis than that contained in the 230 course offered by the University. Professor Roller felt that such a course will be considered on a transfer basis if comparable in content and instruction.

4. One participant wished to emphasize that junior colleges have been very unsuccessful in using lawyers to teach business law, and wondered if it would be possible to hold summer courses at the University to orient junior college business law teachers. An unofficial poll was taken and it appeared that a majority would be willing to attend a summer session of this type.

5. Comments were made regarding communication between the junior colleges and the University. It was felt that if the junior colleges could be notified not only of actions being taken by the University, but also of contemplated actions, it would be of great assistance in course planning.

Dean Williams next introduced Mrs. Betty Sunde, Librarian, who gave a brief history of the Business Administration Library, and also generally described what it has to offer in the way of facilities and reference materials. She explained that a faculty member from a junior college can obtain a "borrower's" card in order to use the Library by presenting a letter of introduction from his respective college.

At this point, the meeting was adjourned for luncheon at the HUB. The program for the luncheon session included a report by Mrs. Louise Martin on the extensive job placement facilities available to seniors and graduates of the College of Business Administration at the University. This report was followed by a discussion by Miner Baker, vice-president and economist for the Seattle-First National Bank, on the business outlook for the state of Washington in 1963.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENTAL MEETING

As a part of the Fifth Annual University-Junior College Conference, the Engineering Departmental Meeting was held on Saturday, February 2, 1963. The registration and coffee period was scheduled from 9:30-10:00 a.m. However, due to inclement weather, hazardous road conditions, and the inherent cautious nature of engineers, participants began arriving shortly after 8:00. During the coffee period, visitors were encouraged to visit the Closed-Circuit Television Room where displays had been arranged depicting the potential uses of CCTV in engineering courses as the General Engineering Department sees them after three quarters of experimental classes.

At ten o'clock the group congregated in the General Engineering Auditorium where Dean Harold E. Wessman delivered the welcoming remarks. Dean Wessman expressed concern over the national drop in engineering enrollment and the effect this decrease would ultimately have on our national technological potential.

Following Dean Wessman, Henry Lennstrom, Registrar of Lower Columbia College, took over as chairman of the meeting.

It had been previously determined that the meeting should vary from the usual format to an informal program, chaired by a junior college person, and in which the principal participants would be junior college people telling what they have been doing in their courses--innovations, deviations, new twists, etc.

Mr. Lennstrom introduced Vernon Hammer, Chairman of the General Engineering Department, Burnett Bonow, member of the University-Junior College Committee, and the following source people from the University who would be available during the break and after the meeting for questions and discussion relative to their particular field: Dr. Victorian Sivertz, Chemistry; Dr. L. A. Sanderman, Physics; and Dr. Richard Pierce, Mathematics.

The first area to be discussed was mathematics. Mr. Larry Staub of Lower Columbia started the discussion, followed by Mr. Robert Godsen of Centralia College. Each indicated the directions which their courses were taking; these comments were followed by a series of questions and comments. One important aspect of the meeting, which might be mentioned at this time, was the warm, outgoing, informal attitude of all of those present; this attitude made for an easy, free interchange of ideas.

In the area of chemistry, Mr. Larry Staub of Lower Columbia passed out a sheet indicating their entire sequence of courses. A question was directed to Dr. Sivertz inquiring how their sequence varied from the University with regard to high school deficiencies. In the discussion following, there developed a virtually complete harmony in the manner in which all of the schools handled this matter.

In the area of physics, Mr. Roy Prevost of Peninsula had some questions concerning high school prerequisites and deficiencies. These were answered by Mr. Sanderman. Little discussion followed in this area, possibly because few of the participants taught physics.

At this point, a representative from Yakima Junior College mentioned that his school had recently purchased some astronomy equipment and felt that the purchase had a twofold purpose: first, it shows the students an actual application of math and physics to a science presently in the forefront, due to space travel, etc., and second, the equipment is being used for evening classes for the entire community, stimulating interest and increasing the general knowledge of astronomy in the community.

At 11:20 a.m. the meeting was adjourned for a coffee break. Visitors were encouraged to witness an informal CCTV demonstration.

The meeting resumed at 11:45 in the General Engineering Auditorium, where Mr. Lynne Robinson of Everett Junior College and Mr. Les Moyer of Olympic College discussed their drawing programs. A lively discussion followed a remark by George Medley of Everett Junior College that he felt the logical place for General Engineering 102 would be at the end of the three quarter drawing sequence, rather than in its present position between 101 and 103. He reasoned that since 102 is more or less applied drawing, we should get all of the theory first, then the application. It was generally agreed that if 101 is properly taught, it should include the basic 103 theory, which would be utilized in 102.

Prof. Joe Colcord of the University's Civil Engineering Department told of the NSF Summer Institute which would be held at the University this summer. He invited all present to submit applications. He supplemented this invitation with the following personal reflections: In order for an engineering instructor to function competently in this ever-changing technological era, he must: 1) be active in his professional society, 2) develop a specialty within his field, 3) belong to an organization which deals with this specialty, 4) continually strive for professional betterment through graduate work, fellowships, and grants.

There were no other comments on surveying.

Mr. G. D. Cooley of Olympic and Mr. Clifford Higer of Everett Junior College discussed their 111-112 problems-statics sequence.

Robert Seabloom of the University's General Engineering Department. indicated that work-energy is being dropped and an introduction to vector notation is replacing it. The first two chapters of Schaums Outline Series on Vector Analysis will supplement Leach and Beakley. The general consensus was that Leach and Beakley "left a lot to be desired" for a 111 text, and some schools were supplementing it with Brown and/or Beer and Johnson problems. There was some indication of unhappiness with Shames for a 112 text, again with some schools supplementing it with problems from Beer and Johnson; but it was generally conceded that Shames has by far the best treatment of the vector approach.

Billy Hartz of the University's Civil Engineering Department indicated that although there are other texts now available, which ostensibly use the vector approach, they have merely "plugged in" vector equations in place of the classical equations. Hence, they have missed the entire point of the vector approach and certainly do not communicate to the reader the power and effectiveness of the vector. Specifically, he mentioned Beer and Johnson as being guilty of this technique. He stated that, for the present, the Civil Engineering Department will retain Shames in teaching Civil Engineering 291.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

2